Vortex matter in $U(1) \times U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ phase-separated superconducting condensates

Julien Garaud[1, 2] and Egor Babaev[1]

[1] *Department of Theoretical Physics, KTH-Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, SE-10691 Sweden*
[2] *Department of Physics, University of Massachusetts Amherst, MA 01003 USA* *

(Dated: January 6, 2015)

We study the properties of vortex solutions and magnetic response of two-component $U(1)\times U(1)\times \mathbb{Z}_2$ superconductors, with phase separation driven by intercomponent density-density interaction. Such a theory can be viewed arising from the breakdown of $SU(2)$ symmetry by a biquadratic interaction between the components of the field. Depending on the symmetry-breaking term, there are two ground-state phases: one where both components of the doublet are equal (the miscible phase) and one where only one component assumes a non zero vacuum expectation value (the immiscible state). In the latter phase, the spectrum of topological excitations contains both domain walls and vortices. We show the existence of another kind of excitation that has properties of both topological excitations at the same time. They combine vorticity together with a circular domain wall, interpolating between inequivalent broken states, that shows up as a ring of localized magnetic flux. Asymptotically, this resembles a vortex carrying multiple flux quanta, but because the magnetic field is localized at a given distance from the center this looks like a pipe. The isolated multiquanta pipelike vortices can be either stable or metastable, even if the system is not type-1. We also discuss the response of such a system to an externally applied magnetic field.

PACS numbers: 74.25.Ha, 74.20.Mn, 74.20.Rp

arXiv:1410.2985v2 [cond-mat.supr-con] 4 Jan 2015

In the recent years, there has been growing interest in models of superconductivity described by more than one superconducting condensate. This interest follows from the growing number of known materials that are described by multiple condensates. One could mention multi-band superconductors such as MgB_2 [1] or iron based superconductors [2]. Also multicomponent models apply to describe unconventional superconductors such as Sr_2RuO_4 that is an exotic superconductor with chiral $p_x + ip_y$ pairing symmetry [3, 4], or heavy fermion compounds such as UPt_3 [5].

The macroscopic physics of multicomponent superconductors is described by Ginzburg-Landau free energy with multiple condensates, that is, a field theory of multiple complex scalars charged under the same $U(1)$ gauge field. There, new physics that has no counterpart in single component systems arises. This comprises vortices carrying fractional amount of flux quantum [6] or nonmonotonic intervortex interactions originating in the additional length scales associated with the extra condensates; for a review see [7].

Multicomponent models with biquadratic density-density interaction are discussed, for example, in the context of superconductors with pair density wave order [8, 9], or in the context of interface superconductors such as $SrTiO_3/LaAlO_3$ [10]. Here we investigate the properties of topological defects in two-component models, in an immiscible phase where there is strong biquadratic interaction between condensates that penalizes coexistence of both condensates. This is modelled by a field theory of a doublet of complex fields that have a $U(1) \times U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry. In the immiscible case that occurs for strong biquadratic interaction, the ground-state spontaneously breaks a $U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ part of the symmetry of the theory.

We show that despite the fact that only one condensate exists in the ground-state, the topological defects' physics is dramatically altered because of the existence of the suppressed condensate. Depending on the values of the symmetry-breaking term, two ground-state phases with different broken symmetries are found. In the first phase, the ground-state spontaneously breaks the $U(1) \times U(1)$ part of the symmetry and both components of the doublet are equal and nonzero. In the second phase, only one component assumes nonzero ground-state density and the ground-state spontaneously breaks $U(1)\times\mathbb{Z}_2$. There, the $U(1)$ part associated with the vanishing condensate, is unbroken. Here, we are principally interested in the latter phase, where the spectrum of topological excitations features both domain walls and vortices.

We demonstrate that in this phase, the coexistence of both kinds of topological defects gives interesting defects that are vortices, but comprising a domain wall as well. That is, it resembles asymptotically a vortex carrying multiple flux quanta, but the magnetic field is localized along a circular domain wall at a given distance from the center. The overall object looks like a pipe. We thus refer to these configurations as pipelike vortices, in analogy with the discussion of pipelike vortices in current-carrying two-component condensates [11].

Below, we introduce the simple two-component Ginzburg-Landau model that has $U(1) \times U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry. We then characterize the different possible ground-state phases of that model. Finally, we numerically investigate the properties of vortices within the phase where both components cannot coexist. We demonstrate that there exists a regime, where pipelike vortices form and they are stable. We eventually discuss the response to an external applied magnetic field.

The model considered here is a Ginzburg-Landau model of two charged condensates described by two complex fields ψ_1 and ψ_2. These can be cast into a single complex vector Ψ, as $\Psi^\dagger = (\psi_1^*, \psi_2^*)$. The theory can be written as a theory with a global $SU(2)$ symmetry that is explicitly broken by an extra inter-component term:

$$\mathcal{F} = \frac{\boldsymbol{B}^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2}|\boldsymbol{D}\Psi|^2 + \frac{\Lambda}{2}\left(\Psi^\dagger\Psi - \Psi_0^2\right)^2 + \delta|\psi_1|^2|\psi_2|^2 \,. \quad (1)$$

In addition to the coupling to the vector potential $\boldsymbol{A}$ of the magnetic field, through the kinetic term $\boldsymbol{D} \equiv \boldsymbol{\nabla} + ie\boldsymbol{A}$ [and $|\boldsymbol{D}\Psi|^2 := (\boldsymbol{D}\Psi)^\dagger \boldsymbol{D}\Psi$], the two condensates interact through the inter-component biquadratic density interaction $(\Lambda + \delta)|\psi_1|^2|\psi_2|^2$. The theory is thus invariant under local $U(1)$ transformations $\boldsymbol{A} \to \boldsymbol{A} - \boldsymbol{\nabla}\chi$ and $\psi_a \to \mathrm{e}^{i\chi}\psi_a$, for arbitrary $\chi(\boldsymbol{x})$. The potential has an $SU(2)$ symmetry that is explicitly broken by the last term when $\delta \neq 0$. When $\delta = 0$, the theory is sometimes called semilocal $SU(2) \times U(1)$ since it has both a global $SU(2)$ symmetry and a local $U(1)$ symmetry group [12]. For generic values of δ, the symmetry of the theory is $U(1) \times U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$. That is, each $U(1)$ is associated with independent global phase rotation of a condensate ψ_a, while the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry is associated to the invariance under the discrete operation that permutes both condensates $\psi_1 \leftrightarrow \psi_2$.

The $U(1) \times U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry of the theory is spontaneously broken by the ground-state. Depending on the symmetry-breaking parameter δ, there are two different phases of the model Eq. (1). When $\delta < 0$, both condensates have the same density $|\psi_1| = |\psi_2| = \Lambda\Psi_0/(\delta + 2\Lambda)$. We call this regime the A-phase, or miscible regime. In the B-phase, the immiscible regime we are principally interested in, only one condensate has nonzero density $(|\psi_1|, |\psi_2|) = (\Psi_0, 0)$ or $(0, \Psi_0)$ and it is stable when $\delta > 0$. This is summarized in Fig. 1. In the higher symmetry state where the $SU(2)$ symmetry is not explicitly broken ($\delta = 0$), only the total density is fixed, $|\psi_1|^2 + |\psi_2|^2 = \Psi_0^2$, and there is a continuous degeneracy to choose the relative density.

Symmetrywise both phases are different. In the A-phase, the ground-state breaks the $U(1) \times U(1)$ symmetry and since it is invariant under permutation of ψ_1 and ψ_2, it has an unbroken $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry. On the other hand, the B-phase spontaneously breaks the $U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ part. The unbroken $U(1)$ symmetry is associated to the condensate that has zero density. There, the topological defects associated with the broken $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry are domain walls interpolating between the two inequivalent ground states $(\Psi_0, 0)$ and $(0, \Psi_0)$. On the other hand, vortices are the topological defects associated with broken $U(1)$ symmetries. In two spatial dimensions, closed domain walls are topologically trivial and thus collapse for dynamical reasons. We show below that interaction with vortices can change that behavior.

We consider field configurations varying in the xy plane and assume invariance with respect to translations along the z axis. To investigate the properties of topological defects, we numerically minimize the free energy [Eq. (1)] within a finite element framework [13]. That is, for a given choice of parameters, a starting configuration with the desired winding is created and the energy is minimized with a non-linear conjugate gradient algorithm. [14] The results of these simulations for vortices in the B-phase, for small δ, are shown in Fig. 2. First, consider a configuration carrying a single flux quantum. There, the component that has nonzero ground-state density (ψ_1) forms a vortex. At the core of ψ_1, because there is less density, it becomes beneficial to give a nonzero value to ψ_2. The suppressed condensate ψ_2 condenses in the vortex core. The corresponding interface energy is positive, so it is preferable to minimize it.

For multiple quanta configurations, there is a competition between the type-2-like repulsion originating in vortices of ψ_1 and the attraction to minimize the interface energy of ψ_2 that condenses in the core. For small δ, it is always preferred to form a bound state of vortices in order to minimize the interface energy. It results in a circular domain at the center of which $\psi_1 = 0$ and the condensate $\psi_2 = \Psi_0$. At a certain distance, depending on the number of enclosed flux quanta, ψ_1 recovers its ground-state density while ψ_2 is completely suppressed. Thus there is a circular domain wall while outgoing from the vortex center. Since the ground-state is realized both at the center and asymptotically, the magnetic field is screened everywhere except at the domain wall. The overall configuration looks like a pipe, thus we refer to this as a pipelike vortex. Pipelike vortices are different from type-



Figure 1. (Color online) – Ground-state properties of the model. This shows the ground-state densities as functions of the explicit symmetry-breaking parameter δ. The parameters are $\Psi_0^2 = 5$, $\Lambda = 1$ and $e = 0.8$. While changing the control parameter δ, the system undergoes a phase transition at $\delta = 0$. For negative δ, the A-phase, both condensates have equal nonzero density and the ground-state breaks $U(1) \times U(1)$ symmetry. In the B-phase, for positive values of δ, the repulsion between condensates is strong enough to penalize co-existence of both condensates and only one component has nonzero ground state density. The broken symmetry is thus $U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$.



Figure 2. (Color online) – Vortex solutions in the B-phase of Fig. 1, for the symmetry-breaking parameter $\delta = 0.02$. The first column shows the magnetic field and the second and third column, respectively show the densities $|\psi_1|^2$ and $|\psi_2|^2$. The different lines show configurations with different vorticity $N = 1$, 2, 3 and 4 respectively. In the B-phase, only one condensate has nonzero ground-state density. Here this is ψ_1, while ψ_2 vanishes asymptotically. Despite not being in a type-1 regime, objects carrying multiple flux quanta are formed. The essential difference from type-1 vortices is that here the magnetic field vanishes at the vortex center.



Figure 3. (Color online) – Deep into the B-phase, vortex structures are substantially different from those obtained for small δ. Here, displayed quantities are the same as in Fig. 2 and the symmetry-breaking parameter is $\delta = 0.4$. It is no more beneficial to condense ψ_2 inside the vortex core. As a results, vortices are simply ordinary vortex solutions embedded in the $U(1) \times U(1) \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ theory [Eq. (1)]. Nevertheless, pipelike vortices may be constructed here but they are metastable. That is, they still can exist but only as local minima of the energy functional. We find that typically configurations carrying a small number of flux quanta easily decay into vortices during the relaxation process, as shown on the second line. Solutions with larger N form but their energy is larger than the one of N isolated vortices. Note that the energy difference becomes smaller as the number flux quanta increase.

1 multiquanta vortices for which the magnetic field is non zero at the center. The pipelike vortices we find here somehow recall pipelike solutions found for vortex configurations carrying persistent longitudinal current, in the $\delta = 0$ case where the model has a global $SU(2)$ symmetry [11]. The reason for screening and the flux localization along the pipe is further discussed later in the paper.

At this point, it is important to recall that the B-phase has domain wall excitations that interpolate between $(\Psi_0, 0)$ and $(0, \Psi_0)$. Thus the interface previously mentioned is exactly such a domain wall. For small δ, domain walls have very small energy and their energy increases while going deeper in the B-phase. There, we can expect a change of behaviour because domain walls are more energetic and condensation in the vortex core becomes much smaller. We find that, indeed, deeper in the B-phase, isolated vortices becomes preferred to pipelike vortices. Nevertheless, we do find the pipelike solutions despite the fact that isolated vortices with no condensation of ψ_2 in the core are preferred. Namely, we found configurations carrying N flux quanta whose energy $E(N)$ is larger than the one of N isolated vortices: $E(N) > NE(N = 1)$. Such configurations are thus local minima of the energy functional and they differ by a few percent from isolated vortices. Such a metastable state is shown in Fig. 3.

In substantially strong external field, vortex matter usually forms dense lattices. The previous results for isolated vortices inform us about the low-field physics. As discussed above, vortex configurations show very interesting structure comprising between the two kinds of topological defects that the theory allows. This may result in quite unusual properties of the solutions in high field. To investigate this, we simulate the response of the system to an external field $\boldsymbol{H} = H_z \boldsymbol{e}_z$ perpendicular to the plane. For this, the Gibbs free energy $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F} - \boldsymbol{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{H}$ is minimized, requiring that $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \boldsymbol{A} = \boldsymbol{H}$ on the boundary [14]. Note that since it is a finite sample with boundary Meissner currents the total flux through the sample does not have to be quantized, even in the standard vortex state.

We start by considering solutions in external field, at the boundary between A- and B- phases. At the point $\delta = 0$ of the phase diagram, where the theory has the $SU(2)$ symmetry, there are no stable type-2 vortices [12, 15, 16]. Note that these vortices can be stabilized by having a twist of the phase in the z direction [17, 18].



Figure 4. (Color online) – Solution in an external field in the very special case of an $SU(2)$ symmetric potential ($\delta = 0$). The other parameters are the same as in Fig. 2. The panels on the first row display the magnetic field and the phase difference $\varphi_{12} = \varphi_2 - \varphi_1$. The second line shows the densities $|\psi_1|^2$ and $|\psi_2|^2$, respectively. Here, although isolated vortices are unstable, they nonetheless form in the external field.



Figure 5. (Color online) – Solution in an external field in the B-phase, for the same parameters as in Fig. 2. There the displayed quantities are the same as in Fig. 4.

This is somehow akin to having a symmetry-breaking term in the potential. Only short pieces of such twisted vortices are stable as they develop an unstable mode similar to hydrostatic Plateau-Rayleigh instability [19]. There are no stable isolated vortices in the theory with $SU(2)$ symmetry, does not imply that its response in external field is trivial. Indeed, isolated vortices exhibit the spreading instability in the $SU(2)$ case. However, there is additional constraint in external field. In Fig. 4, we show that indeed the magnetic response is non-trivial. There are lines of vortices in a given condensate alternating with lines of vortices in the other one. Within a line vortices pair and form some kind of dimer. Note that finite-size effects and interaction with Meissner currents here play some role in deforming the lattice structure. That is, a perfect lattice can form only for tuned domains with periodic boundary conditions. The results in Fig. 4 should be understood as a typical state which would form in experiment, in mesoscopic samples.

For small values of δ, the behavior in external field combines the behaviour reported for the $SU(2)$ symmetry in Fig. 4 and that deep into the B-phase shown in Fig. 6. In this regime, displayed in Fig. 5, the dimers start to merge together. Here again, finite-size effects and interaction with Meissner currents makes it very difficult to have a perfect lattice in this kind of simulation. It is interesting to note, that even when the stability properties of the topological excitations are completely different, the magnetic response can be quite similar to the one at the point with the $SU(2)$ symmetry.

Deeper into the B-phase, the response to an external applied field starts to be quite different from those closer to the $\delta = 0$ point. In Fig. 6, we show that there are alternating regions populated by vortices of different condensates. These alternating regions correspond (approximately) to the two inequivalent ground-states in the B-phase. These regions are separated by a domain wall that carries flux as in Fig. 2. The domain walls form some kind of spiral covering the whole area of the sample. Such a pattern indicates that there is an important in-



Figure 6. (Color online) – Solution in an external field, the parameters are the same as in Fig. 2, but slightly deeper into the B-phase $\delta = 0.2$. Displayed quantities are the same as in Fig. 4. We see that there are alternating regions populated by vortices of different condensates. These alternating regions correspond (approximately) to the two inequivalent ground-states in the B-phase and thus they are separated by a domain wall that carries flux as in Fig. 2. The second panel showing the phase difference tells about position of singularity in both condensates.

terplay between the two kinds of topological defects that the theory supports.



Figure 7. (Color online) – Solution in an external field deeper in the in the B-phase than Fig. 6, for values of the symmetry-breaking parameter $\delta = 0.5$. There the displayed quantities are the same as in Fig. 6. Deep into the B-phase there is preference for usual vortices. However, pipelike vortices are metastable. Note that in external field the stability of pipelike vortices is somewhat enhanced by the pressure exerted by surrounding vortices.

In Fig. 3, we showed that deep into the B-phase, isolated vortices are preferred to pipelike vortices. The latter may still exist but only as metastable states. The deeper into the B-phase, the pipelike vortices are less and less likely. However, as shown in Fig. 7, they still may coexist with regular vortices. Indeed, even if an isolated pipelike vortex is very sensitive to perturbations (as is the case deep into the B-phase), its stability is improved by the surrounding vortices that exert a 'pressure' on the pipelike vortex, making its decay more difficult.

The reason why the magnetic flux is localized along the domain wall can be understood as follows. From Ampère's law $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\times\boldsymbol{B}+\boldsymbol{J}=0$, the total supercurrent reads as $\boldsymbol{J} = e\mathrm{Im}(\Psi^\dagger \boldsymbol{D}\Psi)$ and the contribution due to each component is $\boldsymbol{J}_a = e\mathrm{Im}(\psi_a^* \boldsymbol{D}\psi_a)$. For pipelike vortices, the supercurrents of both components flow in opposite directions. J_2 due to ψ_2 screens the magnetic field inside the domain, while ψ_1 is responsible for screening in the exterior. As a result, the only region where the magnetic flux penetrates is the domain wall. The structure of the superconducting currents in the pipelike vortices can be seen from Fig. 8.

In this paper, we investigated the physical properties of topological defects in a Ginzburg-Landau model of a two-component superconductor that have density-density interaction. It can be seen as a model having an $SU(2)$ potential supplemented by a term that explicitly breaks it down to $U(1)\times U(1)\times\mathbb{Z}_2$. Depending on the symmetry-breaking parameter δ, this model has two physically different phases. When $\delta > 0$, the discrete $\mathbb{Z}_2$ part of the symmetry is spontaneously broken, while when $\delta < 0$ it is not. We have been focusing on the former phase where condensates cannot coexist and the ground-state is either $(\Psi_0, 0)$ or $(0, \Psi_0)$. There, two kinds of topological defects are possible: domain walls and vortices.



Figure 8. (Color online) – Structure of superconducting currents. The first panel displays the total current for a pipelike vortex ($N = 4$), from Fig. 2. Clearly, the supercurrent flows in opposite directions outside and inside the pipe. The region where the current changes its sign is region where the counterflow $-\boldsymbol{J}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{J}_2$ is maximum. In this region the magnetic field is high. The right panel shows a different example of stripe-like counterflow (zoomed in) for the simulation in external field shown, in Fig. 6.

We have shown that, for small symmetry-breaking term, vortices form bound states carrying multiple quanta of flux and exhibit properties of domain walls at the same time. The resulting configuration is a cylindrical inclusion of the component ψ_2 inside a whole domain where $\psi_1 = \Psi_0$. The interface between both regions is a (cylindrical) domain wall where the flux is localized and that resembles a pipe. These pipelike vortices are stable only for small $\delta > 0$. However, deeper in the phase separated regime, they can still exist, but they are metastable.

We acknowledge fruitful discussions with D. F. Agterberg. This work is supported by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation through a Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences Fellowship, by the Swedish Research Council grants 642-2013-7837, 325-2009-7664 and by NSF CAREER Award No. DMR-0955902. The computations were performed on resources provided by the Swedish National Infrastructure for Computing (SNIC) at the National Supercomputer Center at Linköping, Sweden.

* garaud.phys@gmail.com

[1] J. Nagamatsu, N. Nakagawa, T. Muranaka, Y. Zenitani, and J. Akimitsu, Nature **410**, 63 (2001).
[2] P. C. Chu, A. Koshelev, W. Kwok, I. Mazin, U. Welp, and H.-H. Wen (Eds.), Physica C: Superconductivity **469**, 313 (2009).
[3] Y. Maeno, H. Hashimoto, K. Yoshida, S. Nishizaki, T. Fujita, J. G. Bednorz, and F. Lichtenberg, Nature **372**, 532 (1994).
[4] A. P. Mackenzie and Y. Maeno, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 657 (2003).

[5] R. Joynt and L. Taillefer, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 235 (2002).
[6] E. Babaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 067001 (2002).
[7] E. Babaev, J. Carlstrom, J. Garaud, M. Silaev, and J. M. Speight, Physica C **479**, 2 (2012).
[8] D. F. Agterberg and H. Tsunetsugu, Nature Physics **4**, 639 (2008).
[9] E. Berg, E. Fradkin, and S. A. Kivelson, Nat Phys **5**, 830 (2009).
[10] D. F. Agterberg, E. Babaev, and J. Garaud, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 064509 (2014).
[11] M. N. Chernodub and A. S. Nedelin, Phys. Rev. **D81**, 125022 (2010).
[12] This theory was investigated in the framework of high energy physics, where such a symmetry group may occur as a sector of supersymmetric field theories or in the context of grand unification theories. Note that it also corresponds to the bosonic sector of Weinberg-Salam theory where the non-Abelian gauge field decouples, for a review see: A. Achucarro and T. Vachaspati, Phys. Rept. **327**, 347 (2000).
[13] F. Hecht, J. Numer. Math. **20**, 251 (2012).
[14] For detailed discussion on the numerical methods, see for example appendix in: J. Garaud and E. Babaev, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 214507 (2014).
[15] M. Hindmarsh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1263 (1992).
[16] M. Hindmarsh, Nuclear Physics B **392**, 461 (1993).
[17] P. Forgacs, S. Reuillon, and M. S. Volkov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 041601 (2006).
[18] P. Forgacs, S. Reuillon, and M. S. Volkov, Nucl. Phys. **B751**, 390 (2006).
[19] J. Garaud and M. S. Volkov, Nucl. Phys. **B799**, 430 (2008).